



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,553	03/08/2004	Christopher W. Blackburn	1842.026US1	1086
70648 7590 04/03/2009 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/WMS GAMING P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
KRISHNAN, VIVEK V				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2445				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/03/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/796,553

Applicant(s)

BLACKBURN ET AL.

Examiner

Vivek Krishnan

Art Unit

2445

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/88)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :1/12/2009; 7/06/2004; 7/29/2005.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the Amendment/Arguments filed on January 7, 2009. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-28 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. With regard to the IDS filed on January 12, 2009:

It is impractical for the examiner to review the references thoroughly with the number of references cited in the case. By initialing each of the cited references on the accompanying 1449 forms, the examiner is merely acknowledging the submission of the cited references and merely indicating that only a cursory review is made of the cited references.

An applicant's duty of disclosure of material and information is not satisfied by presenting a patent examiner with "a mountain of largely irrelevant [material] from which he is presumed to have been able, with his expertise and with adequate time, to have found the critical [material]. It ignores the real world conditions under which examiners work." *Rohm & Haas Co. v. Crystal Chemical Co.*, 722 F.2d 1556, 1573 [220 USPQ 289] (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984) (Emphasis in original). Patent applicant has a duty not just to disclose pertinent prior art references but to make a disclosure in such way as not to "bury" it within other

disclosures of less relevant prior art; See *Golden Valley Microwave Foods Inc. v. Weaver Popcorn Co. Inc.*, 24 USPQ2d 1801 (N.D. Ind. 1992); *Molins PLC v. Textron Inc.*, 26 USPQ2d 1889, at 1899 (D.Del. 1992); *Penn Yan Boats, Inc. v. Sea Lark Boats, Inc. et al.*, 175 USPQ 260, at 272 (S.D. Fl- 1972).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant's originally filed disclosure fails to provide support for the steps of "receiving by the authentication service from the discovery agent a request to authenticate the gaming service;

providing an authentication response to the discovery agent; and

in response to determining by the discovery agent using the authentication response that the gaming service is authentic, publishing by the discovery agent service information to a service repository to make the gaming service available on the gaming network;" and

"receiving a request to register with the authentication service from *the gaming service*; and processing one or more service requests between *the gaming service* and the authentication service" as recited in Claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant's originally filed disclosure fails to provide support for the limitation "a discovery agent communicable coupled to the gaming network, the discovery agent operable to:

receive a response from the authentication service and using the response to determine if the gaming service is authentic, and

publish service information for the gaming service upon determining the gaming service is authentic;" as recited in Claim 15.

Based on Applicant's specification it appears that the *service provider* is authenticated rather than the *gaming service*. However, Applicant's specification does not support the limitation that the service information for the gaming service is published upon determining that either the gaming service or the service provider is authentic. Furthermore, Applicant's specification does not support the limitation that the gaming service registers with the authentication service and that service requests are exchanged between the gaming service and the authentication service.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6, 9-20, and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163694 A1 to Chen et al. (hereinafter "Chen"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,198,571 B2 to LeMay et al (hereinafter "LeMay") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0144859 to Hsu et al. (hereinafter "Hsu").

7. Regarding Claims 1 and 15, Chen discloses a method for providing an authentication service and an authentication server hosting an authentication service (hereinafter referenced as the system), said server communicably coupled to the [...] network and operable to:

publish the availability of the authentication service on the [...] network (Chen; paragraph 45, discloses publishing the authentication service on the network);

receive a request to register with the authentication service from a service provider on the [...] network (Chen; paragraph 53, discloses receiving a request to register with the authentication service from a service provider on the network); and

sending authentication requests to the authentication service and receiving responses from the authentication service to determine if a client is authentic; process one or more service requests between the service provider and the authentication service, said service requests conforming to an internetworking protocol (Chen; paragraphs 45, 46, 51, and 52, discloses processing service requests, conforming to networking protocol, between the service provider and the authentication service).

Chen does not explicitly disclose, however Hsu discloses a discovery agent receiving service information from [an additional] service (Hsu; paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the service network, as disclosed by Chen, to include an agent receiving information from a service, as disclosed by Hsu, in order to facilitate the discovery of a service and since it was well known to register/publish multiple services on a network.

Chen does not explicitly disclose a gaming network. However, LeMay discloses a gaming network system providing an authentication service, the gaming network system comprising:

a service provider communicably coupled to the gaming network (LeMay; Figure 3, discloses a service provider coupled to the gaming network);

at least one gaming machine communicably coupled to the gaming network and operable to request a service from the service provider (LeMay; Figure 3 and column 5 lines 13-31, discloses gaming machines coupled to the gaming network and operable to request a service from the service provider); and

an authentication server hosting an authentication service [...] (LeMay; Figure 3 and column 5 lines 13-31, an authentication server hosting an authentication service).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply an authentication server hosting an authentication service, as disclosed by Chen, to a gaming network system including a service provider, a gaming machine, and an authentication server, as disclosed by LeMay in order to provide improved authentication service to a gaming network.

8. Regarding Claims 2 and 16, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 1 and 15. Chen and LeMay further disclose wherein the authentication service comprises a web service (Chen; paragraphs 43-45, discloses the authentication service is a web service).

9. Regarding Claims 3 and 17, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 2 and 16. Chen and LeMay further disclose wherein the service request is formatted according to a service description language (Chen; paragraphs 43-45, discloses the service request is formatted according to WSDL).

10. Regarding Claims 4 and 18, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 3 and 17. Chen and LeMay further disclose wherein the service description language is a Web Services Description Language (WSDL) (Chen; paragraphs 43-45, discloses the service description language is WSDL).

11. Regarding Claims 5 and 19, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 2 and 16. Chen and LeMay further disclose wherein the authentication service is registered in a UDDI registry (Chen; paragraphs 43-45, discloses the authentication service is registered in a UDDI registry).

12. Regarding Claims 6 and 20, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 2 and 16. Chen and LeMay further disclose further comprising an authentication database and wherein the authentication service accesses the authentication database (Chen; paragraph 88, discloses an authentication database accessed by the authentication service).

13. Regarding Claims 9 and 23, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 1 and 15. Chen and LeMay further disclose wherein the authentication service is a local service in the gaming network (Chen; paragraph 48, discloses the Authentication Authority and Authentication Handler as part of the business network Intranet.) (LeMay; Figure 3, discloses the authentication service is a local service in the gaming network).

14. Regarding Claims 10 and 24, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 9 and 23. Chen and LeMay further disclose wherein the authentication service is provided at a well known location (Chen; Figure 1 and paragraph 39, discloses providing the authentication service over the Internet).

15. Regarding Claims 11 and 25, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 10 and 24. Chen and LeMay further disclose wherein the well known location comprises a TCP/IP address and port (Chen; Figure 1 and paragraphs 39 and 50, discloses using TCP/IP to communicate over the Internet and thereby discloses that the authentication service is provided at a TCP/IP address and port).

16. Regarding Claims 12 and 26, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 10 and 24. Chen and LeMay further disclose wherein the well known location comprises a message queue (Chen; paragraph 39, discloses the well known location comprises a message queue for SMTP).

17. Regarding Claims 13 and 27, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 10 and 24. Chen and LeMay further disclose wherein the well known location comprises a file location for performing a file transfer operation (Chen; paragraph 39, discloses the well known location comprises a file location for FTP operations).

18. Regarding Claims 14 and 28, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 9 and 23. Chen and LeMay further disclose wherein the authentication service is registered in a local environment for the service (Chen; paragraphs 45-48, discloses registering and running the authentication service at the Authentication Client and Authentication Handler, which are local environments for the authentication service).

19. Claims 7, 8, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen, Hsu, and LeMay as applied to Claims 6 and 20 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0087629 A1 to Juitt et al. (hereinafter "Juitt").

20. Regarding Claims 7 and 21, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 6 and 20. Chen, Hsu, and LeMay do not explicitly disclose, however Juitt discloses wherein the authentication database is accessed using an LDAP protocol (Juitt; paragraph 13, discloses an authentication database accessed by an LDAP authentication server).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify accessing an authentication database, as disclosed by Chen and LeMay, to include accessing an authentication database using LDAP protocol, as disclosed by Juitt.

One of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make this modification in order to provide well known functional protocol for accessing an authentication database.

21. Regarding Claims 8 and 22, Chen, Hsu, and LeMay disclose each and every limitation of Claims 6 and 20. Chen, Hsu, and LeMay do not explicitly disclose, however Juitt discloses wherein the authentication database is accessed using a RADIUS protocol (Juitt; paragraph 13, discloses an authentication database accessed by an RADIUS authentication server).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify accessing an authentication database, as disclosed by Chen and LeMay, to include accessing an authentication database using RADIUS protocol, as disclosed by Juit.

One of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make this modification in order to provide well known functional protocol for accessing an authentication database.

Conclusion

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivek Krishnan whose telephone number is (571) 270-5009. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571) 276-9456. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrice Winder/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/V. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2445